

Kansas State University Performance Report (3rd Year) – 01/01/2009-12/31/2009

Institution: Kansas State University	Contact Person: Brian Niehoff	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-4797; niehoff@ksu.edu	Date: Revised March 18, 2010
---	-------------------------------	---	------------------------------

Regents System Goal A Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency at K-State.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Three-year average of credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education.	FY 2004-2006 = 32,150	Target yr 1: FY 2005-2007 = 32,750 Target yr 2: FY 2006-2008 = 33,500 Target yr 3: FY 2007-2009 = 34,250	Three-year average (FY 2007-2009) credit hours generated for credit courses = 40,567 credits. FY 2006-2008 = 37,185 credits. FY 2005-2007 = 33,346 credits	Increase of 8,417 credits or 26.2% over baseline; increase of 3,383 credits or 9.1% over 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.
2. Number of students in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses.	Fall 2005 = 1,675	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 1,925 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 2,075 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 2,225	Number of students enrolled in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses for Fall 2009 = 2,556. Fall 2008 = 2,854 Students Fall 2007 = 2,522 students	Increase of 881 students or 52.6% over baseline; decrease of 298 students or -10.4% compared to 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.
3. Number of degree programs in which K-State participates through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances (IAA).	Fall 2005 = 3	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 7 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 9 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 11	The number of programs in Fall 2009 = 10. Fall 2008 = 10 Fall 2007 = 7	Increase of seven programs or 233.3% over baseline; No change compared to Fall 2008; Did not meet target.
4. Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.	CY 2005 = 3,621	Target yr 1: CY 2007 = 3,750 Target yr 2: CY 2008 = 3,800 Target yr 3: CY 2009 = 3,890	The number of courses in CY 2009 = 4,989. CY 2008 = 4,604 CY 2007 = 4,213	Increase of 1,368 courses or 37.8% over baseline; increase of 385 courses or 8.4% over 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency at K-State.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Three-year average of credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education.

Data Collection: Compile the number of SCH generated by for-credit courses through the Division of Continuing Education at Kansas State University by fiscal year (summer, fall, spring) and average them over three years. The baseline value is 32,150 SCH, which is the 3-year average for FY 2004-06.

Targets: Continuing Education provides students with different avenues to complete the necessary coursework for graduation or to gain a certification in a specialized area. Students are very adept at using the Internet and appreciate the flexibility provided through enrollment in courses that may fit better with their work schedules and family commitments. Courses are offered in several modes of delivery, including face-to-face, mediated, asynchronous and synchronous formats. These offerings help students with the efficient and effective scheduling of their time, allowing K-State to serve more students who have various scheduling needs. The university has experienced a steady growth in courses offered through continuing education, in part due to the additional number of collaborative programs and courses offered and new certificate programs that have been approved. We anticipate a growth of 600-800 credit hours generated per year.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2008 data. We exceeded our 2009 target.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses.

Data Collection: Determine the headcount & curriculum of all students enrolled in a fall semester Division of Continuing Education (DCE) course in which 66% or more of the delivery is mediated. Students in non-degree-seeking curricula will be removed from the total headcount. The baseline value is 1,675 students for Fall 2005.

Targets: Several factors should contribute to a steady annual increase in the headcount for students in degree-seeking programs who are enrolled in distance education courses for which 66% or more of the delivery is mediated. These factors include increased targeted marketing of DCE distance degree programs to place-bound degree-seeking students; the University continuing to add new distance degree programs each year; and the various 2 + 2 agreements established with community colleges in Kansas and in other parts of the U.S. These courses provide students with the flexibility in scheduling that they need and provide place-bound students with enhanced access. These benefits lead to more students being served and those students being more efficient in completing their degrees. Our optimistic targets reflect an increase of 150 students per year.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, but experienced a decline in the number of degree seeking students compared to our 2008 data. The 2008 performance level reflected a very large increase compared to previous years, and thus, it is not surprising that the 2009 numbers dropped somewhat. In addition, it is also possible that the economic downturn affected place-bound students' opportunities for participation in distance education programs. However, we still substantially exceeded our 2009 target.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of degree programs in which K-State participates through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances (IAA).

Data Collection: Compile the number of degree programs each fall in which K-State participates through the Great Plains IDEA and the KSU IAA, either by offering complete degree programs or courses that are part of a degree program. The baseline value is 3 programs for Fall 2005.

Targets: By collaborating with other universities, K-State enhances its efficiency by participating in or offering degree programs that it could not offer on its own. These programs allow students to remain at K-State instead of transferring to other institutions. Faculty members in a number of our degree programs have begun discussions that we expect will lead to new collaborative offerings. Our target values incorporate these expected collaborations and represent stretch values, since some programs currently under consideration for such collaboration may not be approved or implemented.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to the baseline, but compared to 2008 data, the number of programs did not change. We did not meet our 2009 target. The ten programs initiated include eight degree programs (Community Development, Dietetics, Family Financial Planning, Food Safety and Defense, Gerontology, Merchandising, Youth Development, and Nuclear Engineering) and two programs offering courses in Agricultural Mechanization and Grasslands. More new programs are being developed in agricultural areas, but are not fully approved at this point. These programs will be part of AG*IDEA, which is the agriculture equivalent of the Great Plains IDEA program and includes collaboration with over 20 land grant institutions. At the time the Performance Measures were submitted, collaborative efforts were underway to develop a certificate in Grasslands Management to be available in 2009, but the lack of faculty in this area has prevented it from moving as quickly as initially anticipated. There are several other programs in the pipeline, but they are taking longer to develop than originally estimated. In many cases, this is due to the differential progress of approval processes on partnering campuses. Since both Great Plains IDEA and AG*IDEA involve collaborations, gaining all institutions' approval is required but not always simple. We will continue to create collaborative programs through both the Great Plains IDEA and AG*IDEA in the future.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.

Data Collection: Determine the number of courses during a calendar year for which the instructor uses K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is delivered in a mediated format. The baseline value is 3,621 in CY 2005.

Targets: K-State Online increases the efficiency of both students and faculty. Students have 24/7 access to course materials and information about their grades, and they can submit questions to their instructors at any time. Not all courses will desire to utilize mediated instruction, but a realistic goal might be 75%. Our target values are selected to attain this goal by CY 2009.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2008 data. We exceeded our 2009 target.

Comments: Over the three years of these performance agreements, we have made great strides in improving our efficiency by delivering our programs to broader audiences via distance technology, and by collaborating with other institutions to enhance our ability to deliver educational programs that we have neither the faculty nor the resources to offer through K-State on our own. Aside from the slowdown in the approval and implementation of the Great Plains IDEA and AG*IDEA programs, we have met our targets for Goal A. We will continue to focus on the delivery of distance programs and collaborations in the future, as we have included such objectives in our 2010-2012 performance agreements. We will continue to seek new and more efficient ways to provide high quality academic programs to place-bound students, as well as collaborate with other institutions to offer distance degree programs that no institution could offer by itself.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

Institutional Goal 2: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors by first positioning students to learn and then giving them the opportunity to demonstrate their learning.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Percent of English 100 students enrolled in "Diversity Writing" sections; an overall pass rate of 90% will be maintained.	CY 2005 = 17%	Target yr 1: CY 2007 = 63% Target yr 2: CY 2008 = 73% Target yr 3: CY 2009 = 85%	Percent of English 100 students enrolled in Diversity Writing sections for CY 2009 = 96% (1,598/1,670); the pass rate for English 100 was 93% (1,707/1,843) Percent enrolled in Diversity Writing: CY 2008 = 95.2% CY 2007 = 66.3%	Increase of 79 percentage points over baseline; exceeded the 2009 target of 85%.
2. Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.	FY 2006 = 603	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = 630 Target yr 2: FY 2008 = 660 Target yr 3: FY 2009 = 690	Number of students studying abroad for FY 2009 = 676 students. FY 2008 = 676 students FY 2007 = 660 students	Increase of 76 students over the baseline, but 14 students short of target for 2009. This goal was not met.
3. Percent of K-State associate and bachelor degree graduates who successfully completed a capstone course or experience with a grade of "C" or better.	FY 2005 = 75.3%	Target yr 1: FY2007 = 83% Target yr 2: FY2008 = 85% Target yr 3: FY2009 = 87%	In FY 2009, 91.4% of the students successfully completed a capstone course (3,452 students passed of a total of 3,778 enrolled). FY 2008 = 90.1% FY 2007 = 89%	Increase of 16.1 percentage points over the baseline and a slight increase over 2008; exceeded the 2009 target.
4. Increase in the percent difference between pre-test (1st year students) and post-test (seniors) scores on a management concepts assessment for students majoring in business curricula.	AY 2006 = 27.5%	Target yr 1: AY 2007 = 30% Target yr 2: AY 2008 = 35% Target yr 3: AY 2009 = 40%	In AY 2009, there was a 35% difference between the pre-test and post-test scores. AY 2008 = 30.0% AY 2007 = 27.5%	Increase of 7.5 percentage points over the baseline, and 5 percentage points over 2008 level, but 5 percentage points short of 2009 target. This goal was not met.

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors by first positioning

students to learn and then giving them the opportunity to demonstrate their learning.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Percent of English 100 students enrolled in “Diversity Writing” sections; an overall pass rate of 90% will be maintained.

Data Collection: Enrollment figures (last day of class) will be calculated by dividing the total number of students enrolled in the "Diversity Writing" sections of ENGL 100 ("Expository Writing I") by the total number of students enrolled in all sections of ENGL 100. Pass/fail rates will be calculated by dividing the total number of students who passed by the total number of students in the course at the end of the semester.

Targets: This curriculum transformation project addresses three of our undergraduate learning outcomes: communication, diversity, and critical thinking. The goal of the English department is to, eventually, teach all of the English 100 sections with this methodology. Student work is evaluated via a portfolio method using a common scoring rubric. Assignments in the "Diversity Writing" sections require students to identify, describe, research, and analyze issues of diversity. This approach engages students with diversity issues in society and prepares them to think and write about real world situations. The English department is training new sets of instructors and graduate teaching assistants each fall semester and adding sections as they have instructors trained in this method. In the Fall 2006 semester, 25 GTAs and five instructors will be trained, so that approximately 42% of ENGL 100 sections can be taught using the "Diversity Writing" approach. In the following two fall semesters, additional GTAs and instructors will be trained. By the Fall 2008 semester, the "Diversity Writing" content will be the mainstream curriculum for ENGL 100.

2009 Report: We achieved exceptional improvement over the three year period. Nearly all sections of English 100 are now Diversity Writing sections. The 2009 performance level of 96% significantly exceeds the target percent of 85%. At the same time, we have been able to maintain pass rates of over 90% for all three years of the program, with the 2009 rate at 93%. The uniform training of GTAs and the smaller sections offer a chance for more and higher quality interactions between the instructor and the students. The more personal attention to writing increased the likelihood of improved writing skills among the students.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.

Data Collection: Students who register with our Study Abroad office and successfully complete a study abroad experience will be counted.

Targets: K-State has a goal of increasing the number of students who participate in a study abroad experience, because we believe (and have instituted an assessment plan to measure) that students who have such experiences gain "awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world" - one of our university's undergraduate student learning outcomes. We have been recruiting more students to participate, increasing the number of scholarships available for study abroad, and providing financial support to faculty who want to take groups of students to another country. The national average annual growth in study abroad is 4%; our stretch target values reflect a 5% increase.

2009 Report: The number of students participating in study abroad programs increased above the targeted goals for the first two years of the performance agreement but leveled off during 2009. The number of students in study abroad programs in both 2008 and 2009 was 676. This number exceeded the 2008 goal by 16 students, but for 2009, we were 14 students short of our target. Considering the difficult economy, with unemployment issues facing students, parents and families, it is not surprising that this indicator would be affected. This indicator, compared to the others, depends heavily on students' ability to obtain additional resources to fund their travel. In addition to resources, we were advised to cancel two study abroad trips scheduled during the year for Mexico due to instability in the region. These would have increased our totals over the target level of 690 students.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of K-State associate and bachelor degree graduates who successfully completed a capstone course or experience.

Data Collection: All students in a given academic year who passed, with a grade of "C" or better, one of the courses designated by a department as a capstone course or experience will be counted. This number will be expressed as a percent of the number of students who are awarded associate or bachelors degrees during the academic year.

Targets: As a part of K-State's efforts to establish assessment of student learning as a priority at the department level, we have encouraged faculty to utilize capstone courses or experiences as vehicles for doing comprehensive assessment of integrated learning within the major. In capstone experiences, students are asked to demonstrate the learning of degree program outcomes and university learning outcomes (e.g., communication, critical thinking, ethics) in a final project or within an internship or through a case-based real-world challenge to which they are asked to respond. In some cases, performance is evaluated by both faculty and professionals outside of the university. These courses already existed in many disciplines, and it is our goal to continue to create such experiences. Given that new course development is a complex and sometimes time-consuming process, our target values represent a challenge for us, but are ones we are committed to reaching.

2009 Report: We achieved exceptional improvement in students' successful achievement in capstone courses over the three-year plan. The passing rate increased 16.1 percentage points over the baseline and far exceeded our 2009 target.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase in the percent difference between pre-test (1st year students) and post-test (seniors) scores on a management concepts assessment for students majoring in business curricula.

Data Collection: Students in a 1st-year required business course are given a 40-item exam on management concepts. The same exam is given to seniors in a required business course. The average score for all 1st-year students and the average score for all seniors will be computed and compared.

Targets: With this assessment, management faculty are asking two questions: 1. Do seniors in management know more about management concepts than 1st-year management students; and 2. Do management students know more about management concepts than other business majors (finance, accounting, marketing)? The results of this direct measure will help faculty to modify their teaching methods and/or course content to help students to learn better. The baseline is, at this point, based on only one semester, so targets are modest, but hopeful, as the faculty already have ideas on areas of improvement in their teaching strategies.

2009 Report: The original target for 2009 was to show a 40% difference in exam scores on management concepts between seniors in Management and freshmen in business. In hindsight this may have been an unrealistic goal. During the three years of reporting, scores of seniors in Management increased steadily, but surprisingly, so did the scores of freshmen. It is nice to see incoming freshmen with a better understanding of management concepts; however, such improvements in our freshman baseline created a statistical "moving target." The improvement of learning shown among seniors was less evident when the freshmen also demonstrated increased learning. While the 2009 gap was below the 40% target, it did increase by 17% over 2008. The final performance level of 35% is significantly higher than the 27.5% difference shown in the first year. One noticeable trend for this indicator is that our performance levels each year of the agreements seemed to lag a year behind what we projected. We projected a 30% gap in the first year, but did not reach that gap until the second year. Our actual third year gap of 35% was projected for year two. Considering that the assessment instrument was new and untested when we started, and it took two years to calibrate its level of difficulty, it is possible that the 2009 target would be reached in 2010.

Comments: Indicators 1 and 3 clearly demonstrated enhancements in areas of general education learning. The selected indicators documented high levels of growth and achievement. Indicator 2 is a worthy goal, although limited to fewer students in comparison to the large student population. This indicator is more volatile than the others due to its close ties to the economic stability of families and students, as well as instability in various regions of the world. The performance exceeded the targets in the first two years of the program but leveled out in the third year. It is actually surprising that it did not decrease. Still, to come only 14 students short of our target for 2009 should be considered an accomplishment given the economic downturn in 2008-09. The original target for indicator 4, although reflective of intended growth in one disciplinary area, was probably overly ambitious, and also was dependent on an untested assessment instrument. A realistic achievement of student learning enhancement was documented throughout the plan and, although not fulfilling the original target goal, the results showed a satisfactory level of student learning enhancement. It would have been difficult to predict freshmen (pre-test) scores increasing as they did. Nevertheless, the seniors did show very positive improvements in their learning of management concepts over the three years.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (underrepresented groups and families with limited resources).				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.	Fall 2005 = 595 Hispanic students enrolled.	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 625 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 650 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 665	Hispanic student enrollment for Fall 2009 = 829 students. Fall 2008 = 756 students Fall 2007 = 675 students	Increase of 234 students or 39.3% over the baseline; increase of 73 students or 9.7% over the 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.
2. Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers.	AY 2005-2006 = 4,078	Target yr 1: AY 2006-2007 = 4,100 Target yr 2: AY 2007-2008 = 4,150 Target yr 3: AY 2008-2009 = 4,200	Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers for AY 2008-09 = 4,495. AY 2007-08 = 4,425 students AY 2006-07 = 4,117 students	Increase of 417 students over the baseline and 70 students over 2008 performance level; exceeded the 2009 target.
3. The number of low income individuals/families who are provided nutrition education through the	FY 2005 = 1,290 families and 5,214 youth.	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = 1,369 families and 5,532 youth Target yr 2: FY 2008 = 1,410 families and	For FY 2009, the number of individuals/families	Increase of 962 families and youth combined or 14.8%

Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).		5,697 youth Target yr 3: FY 2009 = 1,452 families and 5,868 youth	provided nutritional education = 1,542 families and 5,924 youth for a total of 7,466. FY 2008 = 1,318 families; 6,177 youth for a total of 7,495 FY 2007 = 1,165 families; 6,471 youth for a total of 7,636.	over the baseline; increase of 224 family contacts and a decrease of 253 youth contacts compared to the 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.
--	--	--	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (underrepresented groups and families with limited resources).

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.

Data Collection: The fall semester 20th day headcount will be used. The headcount includes undergraduate and graduate students. The baseline is 595 Hispanic students for Fall 2005.

Targets: Our baseline enrollment is almost completely composed of long-time Kansas residents. Any significant growth will come from recent immigrants who are first- or second-generation citizens (or undocumented immigrants with resident tuition status). This group is much harder to recruit because of multiple cultural and financial issues. The community colleges in southwest Kansas have significant enrollments of Hispanic students, but these students frequently take small numbers of credit hours and move slowly, if at all, through the associate degree programs. We have recognized the increase in the overall Hispanic population in western Kansas, and we have dedicated resources to recruit prospective Hispanic first- and second-generation students. In addition, on-line distance education provides opportunities for Hispanic students to enroll in K-State courses without leaving home. In reference to the baseline, our target values represent an increase of 12% by 2009. Because of the various factors noted above, we consider our target values to be particularly expansive.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2008 data. We exceeded our 2009 target. One key strategy here might be the implementation of a number of 2+2 programs with community colleges in southwest Kansas. Hispanic students who might not feel comfortable leaving home for four years, were able to complete their first two years of college closer to home, then gain entry to K-State to complete their undergraduate degree. In addition, we have a few dedicated recruiters who work directly with the Hispanic populations in Kansas, which has helped us greatly in connecting with these students. When these students visit campus and after they arrive to enroll, efforts are made to connect them our Hispanic faculty members and our multicultural student organizations.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers.

Data Collection: Twenty percent of the money from tuition increases at K-State is set aside for Need Based Tuition Waivers. Eligibility for the waivers is based on the ability of the student and the student's family to pay for college, rather than on the actual cost of attending college. Since a family's ability to pay generally remains constant, improvement will be measured by an increase in the number of awards.

Targets: Since a family's inability to pay for college is one of the major reasons why potential students do not attend K-State, or withdraw after starting, an increase in the number of awards will result in greater access to students from lower-income families to begin and continue to attend K-State. Given the projected plateauing of tuition increases, the increase in the number of students receiving waivers is expected to taper off also, as is reflected in our targets.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to the baseline, the 2008 total, and the 2009 target level. We exceeded the 2009 target by 295 students who received Need Based Tuition Waivers.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The number of low income individuals/families who are provided nutrition education through the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).

Data Collection: Families and youth enroll in our programs, and we track their progress through a series of 10 or more lessons on nutrition. The number of enrolled families and youth will be compiled.

Targets: K-State's land-grant mission includes enriching the lives of the citizens of Kansas by extending to them opportunities to benefit from the results of research. This indicator is one example of the alignment of our land-grant mission with the Regents goal of increased targeted participation and access to university services. The mission of EFNEP is to assist families and youth with limited resources in making simple changes in eating behaviors so that over time, healthy choices become healthy habits. EFNEP lessons (available in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese/Laotian) help at-risk Kansans develop the skills and behaviors they need to improve their diets and effectively manage resources. Currently, the EFNEP programs assist Kansans in Sedgwick, Shawnee, Crawford and Bourbon counties through the efforts of nutrition assistants. Kansas EFNEP nutrition assistants teach in homes, schools, assisted living sites, prisons, clinics, and libraries. Our targets reflect an increase of 3% in the number of contacts in each of the next three years, as this program is expanded.

2009 Report: We exceeded the target for this indicator. The number of families reached in this program has increased in each of the three years of the agreements, while the number of youths reached has declined. The focus on families was a strategic decision on our part. We felt that by reaching more families, we would actually be able to provide our services to more people in the state. We still provided information to a total youth population that exceeded our 2009 target.

Comments: We feel that our achievements in this Goal area far exceeded our expectations at the start of the 3-year agreements. We are very happy with our accomplishments in these very worthy areas of focus, but we are aware that there is more to do. Given the shifting population in the state of Kansas, we must continue to reach out to Hispanic populations and financially strapped families. The land grant mission of access means that we will continue to emphasize improvements in our recruitment of and financial assistance to such populations.

Regents System Goal E: Increase External Resources				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.	FY 2005 = \$110.9M	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = \$115M Target yr 2: FY 2008	Extramural funding for FY 2009 = \$133.6M. FY 2008 = \$118.0M	Increase of \$22.7M or 20.5% over the baseline; increase of

		= \$118M Target yr 3: FY 2009 = \$120M	FY 2007 = \$114.1M	\$15.7M or 13.3% over the 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.
2. The average amount of private support (cash and deferred) over a three-year period.	Average for FY 2003-2005 = \$74.0M	Target yr 1: FY 2005 – 2007 = \$79M Target yr 2: FY 2006 – 2008 = \$81M Target yr 3: FY 2007 – 2009 = \$83M	Average private support for FY 2007-FY2009 = \$90.8M. FY 2006-FY2008 = \$94.6M FY 2005-FY2007 = \$84.0M	Increase of \$16.8M or 22.7% over the baseline; decrease of \$3.8M or -4.0% over the 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.
3. The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.	Previous 5-year average (2001-2005): Licensing Income = \$232.1K	Target yr 1: For 2002-2006 = \$271K Target yr 2: For 2003-2007 = \$307K Target yr 3: For 2004-2008 = \$340K	For CY 2004-2008, 5-year average cash licensing revenue = \$548.3K. CY 2003-2007 = \$406.5K CY 2002-2006 = \$306.0K	Increase of \$316.2K or 136.21% over the baseline; increase of \$141.8K or 34.9% over the 2008 data; exceeded the 2009 target.

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources

Key Performance Indicator 1: The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.

Data Collection: Self-explanatory. The baseline value is \$110.9M in FY05.

Targets: Emphasis on enhanced research/scholarly activity has resulted in additional external funding, especially with the start of the Biosecurity Research Institute (BRI). The FY 2005 baseline figure is a \$10M increase from FY 2004, which is due in part to the BRI receiving \$4.5M for equipment and \$2M to enhance BRI research activity once the BRI is operational in 2006. Our projected targets are conservatively lower (\$5M, \$3M, and \$2M consecutive increases), since we have taken into consideration concerns about the levels of future federal funding and that the significant BRI funding was a one-time expense for equipment.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2008 data. We exceeded our 2009 target. Such improvement is due primarily to the increased efforts of our faculty. More faculty are seeking higher levels of extramural support for their research. Such funds are necessary for department and college level support, as state funds have been affected by the economy.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The average amount of private support (cash and deferred) over a three-year period.

Data Collection: Dollars generated each fiscal year from new funds, which include both cash and deferred gifts. The amounts are averaged over a three year period. The baseline value for FY 2003-05 is \$74.0M.

Targets: The current capital campaign and other development activities will result in an estimated 2%-3% increase in private support in each of the three target years. A three-year average is used to take into account the volatility of this indicator.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, but showed a decline compared to the 2008 data. We exceeded our 2009 target. This accomplishment was mainly due to the efforts of the K-State Foundation and its capital campaign. The increased funding raised in 2007 and 2008 were the primary drivers in the overall improvement of our 3-year average. However, it must be stated that private giving did decrease in 2009 and caused the overall decline compared to the 2008 data.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.

Data Collection: Determine the average over five years of the amount of licensing revenues and equity received from companies to develop K-State technologies. Our baseline value is a 5-year (2001-2005) average of \$232.1K in licensing income and equity.

Targets: In CY 2004, our total licensing income was \$554.8K, however, based on income in 2001-2003, this appears to be an anomaly. Licensing income was \$110.9K in CY 2003 and \$383.4K in CY 2005. We have incorporated an annual increase of about \$30K into our target values to account for the extreme volatility that can occur in this measure.

2009 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2008 data. We exceeded our 2009 target. During the past 5 years, 70% of our licensing revenue has come from a food ingredient technology, with the remaining revenue from agricultural production technologies, software applications, biotech and advanced chemistry applications.

KBOR use only: Kansas State University
Board comments on the approved performance agreement Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement.
Recommendation and Comments